

The Sun.

SUNDAY, JANUARY 13, 1890.

Subscription by Mail Post-Paid.
DAILY, Per Month..... \$2.00
DAILY, Per Year..... 24.00
SUNDAY, Per Year..... 6.00
DAILY AND SUNDAY, Per Year..... 30.00
DAILY AND SUNDAY, Per Month..... 2.50
Postage to Foreign Countries added.
THE SUN, New York City.

If our friends who favor us with manuscripts for publication will have rejected articles returned, they must in all cases send stamps for that purpose.

Local News.—The City and Suburban News Bureau, 100 N. 10th St., New York, N. Y., is the only one of its kind in the city. It is a free press, and its information is distributed to the press of the whole country.

Americans Applaud the Boers and the Boers' Friends.

We apprehend that some of the London newspapers are again being led astray by their New York correspondents. We are informed by cable that yesterday (Saturday) morning the following statement appeared in the *London Times*: "We are distinctly assured that the readiness of the British Government and nation to resist German interference has been thoroughly appreciated by the American people." For this assertion there is no foundation. It must have emanated from a person whose notions of American public opinion are collected from a few thousand lickspittles, copperheads, renegades, and lickspittles.

The sentiments which the *Times* has been misled into imputing to us are not shared by one-twentieth of one per cent. of the twenty millions of people in the United States. Americans with substantial unanimity would applaud a magnanimous resolve on the part of the Continental powers to sustain the demand of the brave Boers for absolute independence. On the other hand, we feel nothing but contempt and disgust for England's stiff-necked intention to retain over the Transvaal a control to which she never had a moral right, and every pretext for which she has forfeited by gross neglect to shield the Hollanders from outrage on the part of her own subjects. In view of the circumstances preceding and attending the raid of JAMESON'S buccannery, the only Americans who do not sympathize with the claim of the Transvaal to perfect independence of Great Britain are those who are imported or apostate citizens who never heard of Lexington and Concord, or who, in their stunted hearts, regret that such battles were ever fought.

According to the latest news from Pretoria, Dr. JAMESON and his fellow brigands, who unquestionably ought to be hanged, have not yet been released, and it is to be hoped, will not be, until the demands of the injured Hollanders have been complied with. What is it that is now required by these men, who narrowly escaped destruction through the simultaneous action of a rebellion of Uitlanders at Johannesburg and of a piratical irruption on the part of the mounted police of the British South Africa Company? The betrayed and invaded but triumphant Boers propose to the British Government that it shall renounce the species of suzerainty over the Transvaal conceded by the treaty of 1854; that it shall abandon in favor of the Transvaal the privilege of pre-emption with regard to Delagoa Bay obtained by a recent agreement with Portugal; that it shall declare forfeited the charter of the British South Africa Company; that it shall banish Mr. CEIL RHODES and his accomplices from South Africa; and, finally, that for the cost of dealing with troubles which it was the business of Great Britain to prevent, there shall be paid to the Pretoria Government the modest indemnity of £500,000.

There is not one of these demands which to American onlookers does not seem reasonable and righteous. As for the three last proposals, Great Britain for her own sake should instantly accept them, in the eager though vain hope of abolishing the Colonial Office of collision and culpability. Nor is there the slightest room for doubt that, were Lord SALISBURY actuated by the magnanimity and sense of honor evinced by Mr. GLADSTONE in 1881, he would frankly acknowledge that England, having failed to discharge the duty of protecting a vassal State from wrong at the hands of British subjects, had thereby forfeited all claim to any kind of suzerainty. Nor would he, once constrained by probability to recognize the absolute independence of the Transvaal, stoop to the dog-in-the-manger policy of confiscating Delagoa Bay, which to the land-locked republic offers an outlet to the sea. But times have changed since 1881, and men of a different character now bear away in British councils. Lord SALISBURY and Mr. JOSEPH CHAMBERLAIN will, if they can, keep the gallant Hollanders in the same condition of partial dependence, which has exposed them to incursion in the past, and will subject them to like perils in the future. The limit of their meanness and malignancy in dealing with the outraged Boers will be fixed by a cunning calculation of their physical ability. But when England finds that the great Continental powers are not in the least perturbed by a display of bravado in the matter of naval preparations, she will hearken to the voice of equity and justice, unless she is in the grasp of those predestined ruin of States, whose fate, consigning to destruction, first makes mad.

Her Britannic Majesty.

In British diplomacy Queen VICTORIA seems to be unusually active at this time. Repeatedly we have had despatches from London about her conferences with Lord SALISBURY upon the momentous questions that have recently given concern to her Government. We have been made aware of her several commands to Mr. CHAMBERLAIN within the past fortnight to visit her at Osborne, that they might hold communication upon matters of State. We have learned again and again that messengers from the Foreign Office and the Colonial Office had hastened to convey to her such documents of importance as may have come to hand. We have heard of that letter of re-buke which she sent to her warlike grandnephew, the German Kaiser, a few days ago. We have had a copy of the telegraphic message which she commanded the Colonial Secretary to send to President KUGLER of the South African Republic. We have been informed that it is her purpose to review the flying squadron, in case it shall strike out from England.

It is not often that the Queen is so fully occupied with public questions as she is in these times. She has always taken a personal interest in the affairs of the kingdom and the empire, and has made her judgment or her will known whenever she thought fit to do so. She is unquestionably a power in her Government, and more than one Ministry has had occasion to know of the

undesirability of running counter to her Majesty. The theory that "the King reigns, but does not govern," has never received the signature of the Queen. She has reigned for fifty-eight years, and has often taken a hand during that time in the business of governing. It was Mr. ROBERT who once exclaimed: "The Crown! it is the House of Commons!" but her Majesty has never appeared to regard that body as all of the Crown. She keeps a crown that is all her own.

The Queen's influence in her Government, so far as foreign affairs are concerned, has nearly always been of a pacific kind. She is not destitute of the martial spirit, and we suppose it possessed her soul during the Crimean war, the Indian mutiny, and the campaign in Egypt; but she has generally curbed it. She did so, perhaps on account of her affection for Prince ALBERT, during the war in this country, and she appears to have done so during the existing troubles in Turkey. Had she the belligerent temper that some other Queens have had, it might have gone hard with England.

Another thing about her Majesty is that she is a woman who wields an influence upon the other sovereigns of Europe; and this is a matter of special interest in the conduct of British diplomacy. She does not fear to remind her grandson, the German warrior, of his duties; she looks upon her relation by marriage, the Russian Czar, as a younger sister in need of guidance; she is on the best of terms with the Emperor of Austria, and with the King of Italy, and the King of Portugal, Denmark, and Sweden. No British statesman could speak to them, in a motherly, or a sisterly, or a cousinly, or a collateral way. They would not take from any man, not even from a King, such words as her Majesty can pen to them, or utter in their presence. Thus her Majesty possesses a power unlike that of any other sovereign in Europe. She is a veteran diplomatist. When negotiations are afoot, when there is a time of danger, she can make her influence felt from the Thames to the Ouzus.

There is no other sovereign like her in all the world. The Queen Regent of the Netherlands is but a respectable matron, and so is the Queen Regent of Spain. The Queens and Emperors who are the wives of potentates are of small account in affairs of State. The Empress Dowager of China was supposed to be a formidable personality until Japan came to the front. The Queen of Korea ruled her feeble country with a strong hand until last year, when she was assassinated. There lives upon earth but one woman sovereign who is a power in statesmanship. She reigns over England and takes her part in governing it.

Now, why is it that her Majesty has never been heard from in regard to the Venezuelan affair, which is certainly an affair of some concern to England? The Transvaal question, and the remarks of WILLIAM II. about it, have stirred her up; but what of the Venezuelan question and the remarks of Mr. CLEVELAND about it? Her Majesty doubtless possesses abundant information concerning it; she is aware of the flagrant misconduct of her Premier in regard to it; she must have studied the American documents bearing upon the subject; she can have no doubt of her power over the stiff-necked SALISBURY; her judgment must surely be in favor of arbitration between England and Venezuela. She has commanded CHAMBERLAIN to write in her name to President KUGLER at Pretoria, but never a word has she said to President CAGRO at Caracas. We have not a doubt that the Queen can influence her Ministry in the case of Venezuela. Can the sovereign herself have a doubt of her power over her subjects in this case? We are of opinion that the dispute would be brought to arbitration if she were to notify SALISBURY that such is her royal will.

We do not make any appeal to her Majesty. She shall do as she pleases, so far as we are concerned. If she is willing that a diplomatic blunderer shall get her Government into a scrape from which she might save it, she may have cause for regret later on.

Universities, Medieval and Modern.

A history of medieval universities, such as was noticed in THE SUN the other day, naturally leads the reader to inquire how far the conditions under which these institutions were founded still exist, and whether the adaptation to the requirements of modern society is as complete as was the adaptation to the requirements of society in the middle ages. In one respect the conditions have obviously been changed. Before the invention of printing, when books were rare, and hardly accessible anywhere but in the library of the monastery, the student's only fountain of knowledge was the professor's chair. But now, though the recitation and the seminar, as modes of instruction, of course retain their usefulness, the lecture proper is almost superseded by the book. Almost, yet not entirely, for the living voice of a good lecturer still awakens an interest in the subject which is not awakened by the lifeless page. This of course applies to literature only, or to science merely of the popular kind; for exact and experimental science, such as forms the preparation for a profession, the student must of course resort to the schools of physical science, with their anatomical, chemical, and material departments and experiments. This is a function unknown to the universities of the middle ages, when physical science had only just been born in the cell of ROGER BACON. Any subject to be studied professionally must be studied under the guidance of an expert. This is evident in regard to law, and it is true even in the case of English literature if the student intends to qualify himself for teaching.

It would, perhaps, puzzle even the President of a university exactly to define the object of his institution. A hundred, or perhaps fifty, years ago a university would have been designated by its administrators as a place of culture. Such certainly would have been the ideal of a head of a college of Oxford or Cambridge. He would have said: "We do not pretend to impart knowledge of a practical or professional kind. Our aim is to cultivate the mind and develop its powers, not for the purposes of any special calling, but for the general objects of life; and our best instruments for that we find to be the classics and mathematics." An institution of this kind might be adapted to the requirements of a great leisure class such as the sons of the English gentry. But an industrial age, without formally discarding, has to a great extent practically set aside that ideal. It has demanded that the universities shall be schools of useful knowledge, such as prepares for special professions or callings, and will enable the student to earn his bread. At the old English universities, which are still the places of education for a leisure class of gentry, the culture ideal probably continues to prevail; though even there classics and mathematics have been

deposed from their exclusive supremacy, and the door of the curriculum has been opened to more utilitarian subjects, such as modern history, jurisprudence, political economy, and physical science.

But in American universities, notably in those of the latest foundation, the utilitarian or bread-and-butter ideal, has gained the upper hand. Of the culture ideal, there remains little more than may be realized by residence in a general atmosphere of study, with opportunities of intellectual intercourse and by the addition of a modicum of practical knowledge to the professional or general culture. For the wealthy student the main object may still be culture, and he may make his option, usually, perhaps, a soft option, with that object in view. To the ordinary student the university is no longer a school of culture, but a magazine of knowledge of various kinds out of which he chooses the department suited to his destiny in life. Greek and Latin still have a place, and one at least of ostensible honor, in the curriculum; but they stand cheek by jowl not only with English literature, political economy, physics, chemistry, botany, zoology, and geology, but with agriculture, horticulture, veterinary science, architecture, dentistry, and civil engineering.

What would a former President, we will not say of an Oxford or Cambridge college, but of Harvard or Yale, have said to the student who enters a school, or a university, and into his temple of the Muses? He would have recoiled probably even from the admission of modern languages. In this respect, if historic precedent is of value, the broad-and-butter of our day may claim that it is no innovation, but a reversion to the university of the middle ages; for the medieval boy who trudged up with his wallet on his back to study theology at Paris, civil and canon law at Bologna, or medicine at Salerno, looked not only for the expansion of his intellectual powers and the refinement of his taste, but for the most substantial fruits of his labor.

It is, however, not as places only for the education of youth that universities should be regarded. They have another, perhaps a higher, function to perform. They have, through their professoriate, to advance learning and science, doing for us what BACON intended to be done by his "Nova Atlantis." This was hardly possible so long as study ended with graduation, while at the same time the professor was wholly taken up with teaching, and he was allowed no time for study and research. An improvement in this respect has been made, in the higher universities at least, by the more liberal treatment of professors, and by provision for post-graduate studies such as is made at Johns Hopkins University and elsewhere, as well as by the enlargement of university libraries and of other academic facilities for research. The good effects are visible in American literature and science. A spirit of research and of critical accuracy has manifestly been gaining ground in all departments of knowledge. In some departments there seems even a danger of our becoming too professorial. This may be said especially in regard to history, which is in some danger of being emptied of its personal and ethical element by an exaggerated devotion to severe science. Our grateful homage is due to the austere masters of research such as GIBBS and STUBBS, and we can well understand the preference given to them by professional erudition over MACAULAY or CARLYLE. But the mass even of educated people would find difficulty in reading GIBBS or STUBBS, and still more difficult in remembering what they had read. History, presented only in so extremely professorial a guise, would cease to delight and educate mankind.

Oxford and Cambridge have been endowed with the incongruous privilege of sending representatives to Parliament. This has involved them in party politics, while their close connection with the Established Church has hitherto made them handmaids of Anglican ascendancy and battlefields of ecclesiastical strife. American universities happily are free from such influences, and are at liberty to serve the republic impartially at once by promoting a higher treatment of political subjects, and by instilling a regard for principle such as may elevate the tone of public life. This there seems to be little doubt that they are doing. They moreover exercise a useful influence simply as great and stable institutions in the midst of a vast and migratory population, which, without such centers and bonds of association, would be in danger of becoming as BACON said a nation without its continuous traditions would become, like the files of a summer.

It is said, probably with truth, that there are too many universities in the United States. American founders, unlike the founders of Oxford and Cambridge colleges, have unluckily chosen each to create a separate institution of his own, instead of combining to build up a great university among them. Universities have thus been multiplied beyond measure. The number of universities and colleges in the United States is now probably nearer to five hundred than four hundred. There are upward of twenty in the State of New York alone. The number of students is at the present day probably not far short of one hundred and forty thousand, a large increase having been made within the last few years by the influx of women. A weak university, unless sustained by a religious sect, can only subsist by any other means than by the "soft" graduation of the standard must be lowered, and there will be danger of tempting into intellectual callings youths whom it would be better both for the good of society and for their own happiness to leave in the office, at the store, or perhaps even at the plough. Free high schools, where they exist, cannot fail to contribute to this result. They form the tempting ladder up which a rural boy too often climbs to an elevation at which he has nothing to sustain him. Law and medicine are thus becoming overcrowded. It is in vain that the strong universities raise their standard of admission and graduation, while their weaker sisters can subsist only by keeping the standard low.

This is a danger not academic only, but economical and social, which ought not to be overlooked. The utility of graduation, combined with the growing preference for intellectual over manual callings, and the increased love of city life, may lead to the production of a multitude of graduates for whom there will be no suitable employment, and who may not only be miserable, but, in the end, dangerous to society. It is from an element of this kind, if we are rightly informed, that nihilism draws not a few of its recruits.

The munificent founder of an American university once said that he hoped the day would come when there would be five thousand students in his halls. It was answered that if that day should come the institution would be in danger of proving a bane instead of a blessing to the State. The day would come when the five thousand graduates, and the five thousand would have either to starve or to resort to

some undesirable means of earning their bread. That so great a diffusion of high education, especially in the scientific line, sets the inventive intellect of the nation widely at work may be true; but this hardly compensates for the peril. A consolidation of the universities in each State, if it were possible, would be both academically and socially a great gain. Of a national university, though the idea may be taking, there seems to be no practical need, while there would be reason to fear that such an institution would not be free from the influence of political party. Perfect political neutrality is essential to the exercise by the universities of a wholesome influence on national life.

Shall a boy be sent to the university? The answer to this question has in the majority of cases been greatly simplified by the change in the character of the universities from places of general culture to places of practical instruction and preparation for professions. A boy destined for a scientific or intellectual calling must of course pass through its entrance gate. In the days of general culture many boys went, who had better have stayed away. They had no general taste or aptitude for learning. They could not, like boys in a school, be compelled to work. They spent their three years in a way too truly depicted in such books as "Vandana Green," and they contracted habits of idleness, if not worse habits still. In an office or in regular business of any kind a boy is under command and discipline, his hours are regulated, his character is formed to industry, and his work, if it is not of a wholly mechanical kind, at all events sharpens his intellect, and he imbibes a certain amount of general knowledge even from the social medium in which he lives. Education is not now confined to schools or universities, nor is it limited to the early period of life. COBURN was ridiculed for saying that there was more to be learned from the *Times* than from THUCYDIDES. Yet it is certain that a daily reader of the *Times* imbibes a large amount and a great variety of knowledge. Whether your boy should be sent to a university without a professional or definite object, for the sake of general culture, unless he has shown a decided taste for intellectual pursuits, is, therefore, extremely doubtful, though it may not be easy to say so. It is to be said, in the interval between school and marriage, with a young man destined to a life of idleness and pleasure, how to educate young millionaires so that they shall not be nuisances to the community is a problem of which no solution has yet been found.

GOLDWIN SMITH.

The Distribution of Our Foreign-born Population.

A correspondent of THE SUN has called attention to the extraordinary statement made by the Rev. WILBUR F. CRAFTS in an article on "Political Betterments Through Improved Legislation," in the *American Magazine of Civics* for January. The Rev. Mr. CRAFTS urges the imposition, wherever possible, of an educational qualification for the suffrage, in order "to keep ignorant immigrants from dominating the North." In most States, he thinks, this could be done by "the American vote, reinforced by the large majority of foreigners who are American in spirit." But in thirteen States he apparently regards the case as hopeless:

"In thirteen States an unlucky thirteen—the foreign-born are a majority."

It is a pity that the Rev. Mr. CRAFTS should not undertake to specify the "unlucky" thirteen States of the Union, wherein a majority of the population is of foreign birth. Then, perhaps, we could trace the origin of the amazing misstatement which he so confidently puts forth.

The fact is, that not only in no State of the Union is the foreign-born population in excess of the native, but in only two States is it even one-third of the total. Those States are North Dakota and Minnesota. The figures of the Eleventh Census were accessible to the Rev. Mr. CRAFTS:

State.	Foreign-born.	Per cent.
Maine.....	78,001	11.94
New Hampshire.....	72,100	13.95
Vermont.....	44,008	15.96
Massachusetts.....	657,187	30.25
Rhode Island.....	100,800	30.77
Connecticut.....	183,001	22.00
Delaware.....	171,000	25.99
New Jersey.....	325,075	22.07
Pennsylvania.....	845,720	16.04
Ohio.....	181,161	7.81
Indiana.....	146,999	8.29
District of Columbia.....	18,770	8.15
Virginia.....	18,874	1.11
West Virginia.....	18,869	2.48
North Carolina.....	171,000	10.95
South Carolina.....	9,870	0.54
Georgia.....	13,137	0.96
Florida.....	22,939	5.06
Alabama.....	426,283	12.51
Mississippi.....	91,035	27.40
Illinois.....	842,947	22.01
Michigan.....	540,880	20.97
Wisconsin.....	510,109	25.78
Minnesota.....	467,850	35.98
Iowa.....	394,009	18.05
Missouri.....	234,865	15.77
North Dakota.....	81,481	44.18
South Dakota.....	171,000	27.40
Nebraska.....	202,543	10.13
Kansas.....	147,838	10.39
Kentucky.....	90,356	8.10
Tennessee.....	102,000	6.45
Arkansas.....	94,000	11.12
Mississippi.....	14,722	0.93
Louisiana.....	40,747	4.45
Texas.....	102,000	6.45
Oklahoma.....	94,000	11.12
Arkansas.....	14,722	0.93
Montana.....	43,000	26.61
Wyoming.....	14,013	24.57
Idaho.....	10,000	11.12
New Mexico.....	11,259	7.83
Arizona.....	18,795	81.98
Utah.....	33,084	25.59
Colorado.....	17,011	23.00
Idaho.....	17,400	20.70
Washington.....	90,005	25.36
Oregon.....	57,317	18.92
California.....	806,500	30.37
Total.....	9,240,547	14.77

If that this "certain" meant was that in thirteen States the foreign-born naturalized males of voting age outnumber the native voters, he was as far from the truth as if he intended to include the whole population. In five States, namely, Wisconsin, Minnesota, North Dakota, Nevada, and California, the foreign-born males of voting age, naturalized and not naturalized included, exceed the native males of voting age; but in no State of the Union do the naturalized males of voting age outnumber the native voters. This may be seen from the subjoined table, the figures being those of the Eleventh Census:

Native Males of Naturalized Foreigners.	Native Males of Naturalized Foreigners.
Maine.....	170,771
New Hampshire.....	170,771
Vermont.....	170,771
Massachusetts.....	170,771
Rhode Island.....	170,771
Connecticut.....	170,771
Delaware.....	170,771
New Jersey.....	170,771
Pennsylvania.....	170,771
Ohio.....	170,771
Indiana.....	170,771
District of Columbia.....	170,771
Virginia.....	170,771
West Virginia.....	170,771
North Carolina.....	170,771
South Carolina.....	170,771
Georgia.....	170,771
Florida.....	170,771

Native Males of Naturalized Foreigners.	Native Males of Naturalized Foreigners.
Ohio.....	170,771
Indiana.....	170,771
Michigan.....	170,771
Wisconsin.....	170,771
Minnesota.....	170,771
Iowa.....	170,771
Missouri.....	170,771
North Dakota.....	170,771
South Dakota.....	170,771
Nebraska.....	170,771
Kansas.....	170,771
Kentucky.....	170,771
Tennessee.....	170,771
Arkansas.....	170,771
Mississippi.....	170,771
Louisiana.....	170,771
Texas.....	170,771
Oklahoma.....	170,771
Arkansas.....	170,771
Montana.....	170,771
Wyoming.....	170,771
Idaho.....	170,771
New Mexico.....	170,771
Arizona.....	170,771
Utah.....	170,771
Colorado.....	170,771
Idaho.....	170,771
Washington.....	170,771
Oregon.....	170,771
California.....	170,771
Total.....	170,771

These two tables are well worth study because they exhibit the geographical distribution of our foreign-born population and our foreign-born citizens. We shall not waste words on the Rev. WILBUR F. CRAFTS' bigoted and impudent assertion that American institutions are menaced by an element which includes some of our best Americans; citizens who proved their Americanism when the unity of the republic was in danger thirty and more years ago, and who will be among the first at the front in defence of the flag the next time it is waved for war. We are concerned just now only with the "certain" statistics. Why is it that in matters of fact and of figures we are so frequently compelled to expose and rebuke the inexcusable reckless misstatements of men of Mr. CRAFTS' profession? Why are ministers of the Gospel so often guilty of wild exaggerations and statistical blunders which would be unpardonable in a college freshman, writing his first theme?

The Judicial Gown Question.

In an editorial paragraph on the opening of the appellate division of the Supreme Court in this city and in Brooklyn the *New York Tribune* makes this comment:

"It is noticeable that while the Appellate Judges in this city wore black gowns, those in Brooklyn appeared in their customary dress. Uniformity in this matter would appear to be desirable."

In October and December, the Supreme Court Justices assigned to duty in the appellate division met in convention at Albany, as required by law, to revise the general rules of procedure which regulate the transaction of business in the courts of record of the State. At the October meeting of the court a discussion was had on the proposed adoption of gowns as an appropriate costume for the new tribunal. There were sixteen Judges present, and upon a vote being taken there were found to be eight votes in favor of the gown and eight against it.

The subject was again brought before the convention of Judges at their final meeting in December. The Appellate Justices from this city presented for the consideration of the convention a memorial in favor of gowns which they had received from the leading members of the New York bar. A similar memorial was presented from members of the bar in the Buffalo district. It appeared, however, that in the Albany and Brooklyn departments there had been no such expression of sentiment on the part of the legal profession; and in the absence of any feeling in favor of gowns on the part of the lawyers, the Judges from those portions of the State were unwilling to adopt them.

The view that finally prevailed was that the matter should be left to each judicial department for decision, and the resolution in favor of gowns was laid on the table by a vote of twelve to six. The costume of those who administer justice in an important appellate tribunal should be simple, appropriate, and to some extent uniform in appearance. It may be that the gown is more conducive to dignity than any other dress that can be adopted, though we are in doubt on that point. At all events, it would be in bad taste for the Judges to assume that garb in any district where it was not favored by the bar, especially when we consider the action of the recent convention at Albany in reference to the subject.

The Plan to Attack Turkey.

Although less is now heard of the recent rumor that a demonstration was to be made by our navy in the Mediterranean, including the seizure, if necessary, of some Turkish seacoast city, there is reason for believing that such a plan of campaign has been drawn up and is still under consideration. The temptation to attack Turkey should she refuse to consider our indemnity demands for the destruction of American property, can be understood. She is expected to be an easy prey. The North Atlantic squadron, under Admiral BICE, would be reinforced possibly by the Newark from the South Atlantic station, and even by the best of the vessels of the Asiatic station, which would pass through the Suez Canal.

It is thought that Turkey would be able to do little against this fleet, as her navy is not in good condition; and since a counter attack against our coast would be absolutely impossible, an element of anxiety for us that would arise in a contest with England or France is wanting. It is further argued that no foreign power would interfere with a demonstration confined to the collection of an indemnity like England's at Corinto.

Thus the opportunity to make an effective parade of our available navy at this juncture, and, perhaps still, is tempting. It might, we may concede, earn us some prestige, and would be an answer to the charge that we are neglecting American interests in Armenia on account of the Venezuela dispute. At all events, the main point is that such a plan of operations against Turkey has been formed. But it would be a great blunder to carry out this plan at the present time. There is no part of it that could not be better performed a year from this time. We shall then have a vastly stronger available fleet, including the powerful armorclads Massachusetts and Oregon. There would be far more reason then for the demonstration, because Turkey's delay would have become unreasonable, and it can scarcely be called so now. But the decisive reason why such a demonstration would be a censurable risk is the state of our dispute with England, which forbids sending all our best ships to the eastern end of the Mediterranean when they might suddenly be needed on our coast. There they could be trapped at the end of a blind alley, with England's overwhelming fleet sealing up the Straits of Gibraltar.

Not action of the plan by sending a fleet of our vessels thither. Should Turkey conclude to cope with that part, we might be

drawn into a war which, with patience, will probably become needless, and above all, would distract our energies from affairs immeasurably more important.

The WILSON Tariff law cannot be defended by accusations against the McKinley law. One fault of the Wilson law is that it does not do the desired revenue. If the McKinley law had wiped out customs receipts to the last dollar, the Wilson law would be unfit to stay on the statute books, all the same.

We agree perfectly with the *London Times* that the idea of a permanent and general antagonism between the United States and Great Britain is not now worth discussing.

We congratulate our esteemed contemporary, Nordholt, and more especially its accomplished editor, Mr. John V. Ostrander, for having published translation into Swedish of "England and America." It includes the sonnet by WILLIAM WATSON addressed to the United States, and the reply by W. H. OSTRANDER addressed to England, just as the two appeared together in THE SUN a few days since. Mr. VOKA is, in our opinion, an accomplished journalist as well as a poet, and these two sonnets have a most interesting ring in the noble and highly cultivated language of Scandinavia.

Brooklyn is to have a new Park Commissioner, Mr. THOMAS L. WOODRUFF. In place of Mr. BAYNE, the Park Commission starts with a thorough understanding of the duties and the restraints imposed upon a Park Commissioner. If he does, so much the better; and if he doesn't, the learning indispensable for him can be summed up in a few lines.

Instead of being the monarch of all he surveys, the new Commissioner is to be a servant of the people, properly designed for public use by professional students of park making, and to be held forever subject to their influence. Mr. WOODRUFF cannot properly plant a tree in Prospect Park, or change a line of its plan, or erect a monument without the sanction and cooperation of some of the professional students of park making, and to be held forever subject to their influence. Mr. WOODRUFF cannot properly plant a tree in Prospect Park, or change a line of its plan, or erect a monument without the sanction and cooperation of some of the professional students of park making, and to be held forever subject to their influence. Mr. WOODRUFF cannot properly plant a tree in Prospect Park, or change a line of its plan, or erect a monument without the sanction and cooperation of some of the professional students of park making, and to be held forever subject to their influence. Mr. WOODRUFF cannot properly plant a tree in Prospect Park, or change a line of its plan, or erect a monument without the sanction and cooperation of some of the professional students of park making, and to be held forever subject to their influence. Mr. WOODRUFF cannot properly plant a tree in Prospect Park, or change a line of its plan, or erect a monument without the sanction and cooperation of some of the professional students of park making, and to be held forever subject to their influence. Mr. WOODRUFF cannot properly plant a tree in Prospect Park, or change a line of its plan, or erect a monument without the sanction and cooperation of some of the professional students of park making, and to be held forever subject to their influence. Mr. WOODRUFF cannot properly plant a tree in Prospect Park, or change a line of its plan, or erect a monument without the sanction and cooperation of some of the professional students of park making, and to be held forever subject to their influence. Mr. WOODRUFF cannot properly plant a tree in Prospect Park, or change a line of its plan, or erect a monument without the sanction and cooperation of some of the professional students of park making, and to be held forever subject to their influence. Mr. WOODRUFF cannot properly plant a tree in Prospect Park, or change a line of its plan, or erect a monument without the sanction and cooperation of some of the professional students of park making, and to be held forever subject to their influence. Mr. WOODRUFF cannot properly plant a tree in Prospect Park, or change a line of its plan, or erect a monument without the sanction and cooperation of some of the professional students of park making, and to be held forever subject to their influence. Mr. WOODRUFF cannot properly plant a tree in Prospect Park, or change a line of its plan, or erect a monument without the sanction and cooperation of some of the professional students of park making, and to be held forever subject to their influence. Mr. WOODRUFF cannot properly plant a tree in Prospect Park, or change a line of its plan, or erect a monument without the sanction and cooperation of some of the professional students of park making, and to be held forever subject to their influence. Mr. WOODRUFF cannot properly plant a tree in Prospect Park, or change a line of its plan, or erect a monument without the sanction and cooperation of some of the professional students of park making, and to be held forever subject to their influence. Mr. WOODRUFF cannot properly plant a tree in Prospect Park, or change a line of its plan, or erect a monument without the sanction and cooperation of some of the professional students of park making,